

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF  
PAUL A. LOGSDON,**

**COMPLAINANT,**

**V.**

**CASE NO. 17-2389-EL-CSS**

**ENGIE RETAIL, LLC D/B/A/ THINK ENERGY,**

**RESPONDENT.**

**ENTRY**

Entered in the Journal on January 12, 2018

{¶ 1} Pursuant to R.C. 4905.26, the Commission has authority to consider written complaints filed against a public utility by any person or corporation regarding any rate, service, regulation, or practice relating to any service furnished by the public utility that is in any respect unjust, unreasonable, insufficient, or unjustly discriminatory. Pursuant to R.C. 4928.16 and R.C. 4929.24, the Commission has jurisdiction under R.C. 4905.26, upon complaint of any person, regarding the provision by an electric services company and retail natural gas supplier subject to certification under R.C. 4928.08 and 4929.20 of any service for which it is subject to certification.

{¶ 2} Engie Retail, LLC d/b/a Think Energy (Think Energy or Respondent) is a competitive retail electric service provider, as defined in R.C. 4928.01, and a competitive retail natural gas service provider, as defined in R. C. 4929.01, and, as such, is subject to certification by this Commission.

{¶ 3} On November 20, 2017, Paul A. Logsdon (Complainant) filed a complaint against Think Energy. The Complainant alleges that he and his wife were customers of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. and Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio and that he was transferred, without authority (“slammed”), to Think Energy for gas and electric service. The Complainant alleges that the voice recording and the signed contract are fabricated.

{¶ 4} On December 29, 2017, Think Energy filed a motion for leave to file out of time, along with an answer and a motion to dismiss. In its answer, Think Energy denies the

material allegations in the complaint. In its motion for leave to file out of time and in its motion to dismiss, Think Energy explains that on November 21, 2017, Think Energy contacted the Complainant and resolved this matter to the Complainant's satisfaction. In addition, Think Energy submitted information to the Commission's Staff regarding the Complainant's satisfaction with the resolution. Think Energy believed that no further action was necessary at that time. Think Energy, therefore, did not respond to the complaint within the 20-day period.

{¶ 5} The attorney examiner finds that Think Energy has stated good cause for leave to plead out of time. Accordingly, the answer shall be accepted as if timely filed. The attorney examiner shall grant the Complainant 20 days from the date of this Entry to file a written response indicating whether he wishes to pursue the complaint. If the Complainant does not file a written response, the attorney examiner will recommend that the dispute be presumed satisfied and settled and that the complaint be dismissed.

{¶ 6} It is, therefore,

{¶ 7} ORDERED, That, pursuant to Paragraph 5, the Complainant be granted 20 days to respond to the Respondent's assertion that the complaint has been satisfied. It is, further,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties and interested persons of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/ L. Douglas Jennings

By: L. Douglas Jennings  
Attorney Examiner

jrj/vrm

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**1/12/2018 2:21:09 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 17-2389-EL-CSS**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry providing complainant 20 days to respond to motion to dismiss; electronically filed by Vesta R Miller on behalf of L. Douglas Jennings, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio